as--because in their entirety they certainly are statements against interest, but there are large numbers of
the responses shall we say or communications from JLC
1006 that aren't hearsay in any event because they are
questions or mere confirmations of what was just stated
to him by Sharee Miller.

I think, let me see what page it is first. For example, page 4, about a third of the way up from the bottom, JLC 1006, you will never see him again, is certainly a statement against interest, but in its entirety certainly this document to the extent it contains communications from Jerry Cassaday is a statement against his penal interest and certainly as we have analyzed in this matter previously, had he not committed suicide it certainly would be available and it would certainly subject him to criminal liability for the homicide of Bruce Miller.

The Court has previously gone over the factors set forth in <u>Poole</u> as an alternative basis for concluding the reliability of a hearsay statement at page 165 and those factors certainly seem to me to fit here again, voluntarily communicating with Miller, contemporaneously communicating with Miller regarding an incident that appears to have occurred just within a day or less, from the time of the communications. Certainly to

a friend, and those things all favor, as I said, a find-1 ing and a conclusion of reliability. So it would be 2 very difficult for this Court to conclude that Judge 3 Hughes made any error in his conclusion admitting this 4 information or in using it to bind this case over to 5 circuit court. So to that extent again the motion would 6 be denied, and this will be admissible at trial. 7 Now, we can move on. 8 MR. NICKOLA: Judge? 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MR, NICKOLA: Just so I understand, as it re-11 lates to the Court's ruling today, the Court is ruling 12 that these are admissible as well as--13 THE COURT: Yes, that is what we are doing, yes. 14 MR. NICKOLA: Okay. ₩e11, I--15 THE COURT: Absolutely. 16 Again, assuming they lay the foundation that 17 they already laid at the district court again before the 18 19 jury--MR. NICKOLA: Okav--20 THE COURT: --in the circuit court. 21 MR. NICKOLA: Thank you, Judge. I just wanted 22 to make sure that--23 THE COURT: Yeah. Oh, they'd have to lay the 24 foundation and I assume they understand that they will 25

do that--1 MR. NICKOLA: All right--2 THE COURT: --with the witnesses--3 MR. NICKOLA: Thank you, Judge--4 THE COURT: --that deal with the procuring of 5 the disks or the transmissions from Virginia, whatever. 6 MR. NICKOLA: Thank you, Judge. 7 THE COURT: All right, all right. 8 Now, let's see here, if we can go on then, do 9 you want talk about any of the other instant messages at 10 this time, there is one I wanna ask all of you about as 11 long as we are right in this little category, and if I 12 could have Major show you of one, whether this is some-13 thing anybody plans to use or was this just a mistake I 14 received it because it is impossible to conclude, for me 15 to conclude anything about it from looking at it. 16 (Counsel conferring) 17 Should we just--that is nothing that will be in-18 volved in the case? 19 MR. PLUMMER: No, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Just a mistake in--probably that I 21 got it, all right. 22 Are there other instant messages though, if 23 there are I just wanna know, how many are you planning 24 to likely, other than this particular one that we have 25

1	discussed specifically today?
2	MS. MABRY: None other than the one you've just
3	addressed.
4	THE COURT: This one.
5	MS. MABRY: The others are electronic mail.
6	THE COURT: Well, maybe I will have him show you
7	this one and just to be positive, I think this also was
8	one that, again, whether it was admitted I don't know,
9	but at the beginning I couldn't tell if there was some-
10	thing cut off the top of it and whether it is part of
11	something else or was used by you or will be used by
12	you, just clarify please.
13	(Counsel conferring)
14	MR. PLUMMER: Your Honor, we need just another
15	minute.
16	THE COURT: Yeah, you can take a minute, go
17	ahead, look at it, everybody take a look.
18	(Counsel conferring)
19	(At 10:28 a.m. court off record)
20	(At 10:31 a.m. court reconvened)
21	MR. PLUMMER: Mr. Nickola is still review-
22	ing the document
23	THE COURT: That's all right
24	MR. PLUMMER:for the Court I would state that
25	is an instant message that the People would likely seek
	I

1	admissibility of during the trial.
2	MR. NICKOLA: Judge, asas
3	THE COURT: Yes, you all wanna look at it more,
4	I don't know if youI assume you have seen it, Mr.
5	Nickola, but
6	MR. NICKOLA: Well, it never has been sought to
7	be admitted at the district court level andand,
8	frankly, it's not a part of and it was not identified in
9	the motion that the prosecutor had filed for today
10	THE COURT: No, well, I don't know if it was in
11	her motion
12	MR. NICKOLA: Well, I know, I know
13	THE COURT:specifically, I guess I'll have to
14	dig it out.
15	MR. NICKOLA: There was
16	THE COURT: Did you, see I don't know how you
17	have exactly exchanged, I assumed you have had discovery
18	and provided him with all the proposed exhibits before
19	now, Ms. Mabry.
20	MS. MABRY: That'sthat is true.
21	THE COURT: And that's one of them?
22	MS. MABRY: Yes.
23	THE COURT: And the date on it is October some-
24	thing, I think 24 maybe
25	MR. PLUMMER: September 24th, your Honor.
	1

THE COURT: September 24.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NICKOLA: Yes. Well, Judge, yes, Judge, not only had they submitted me documentation, but there is many more e-mails than their motion has sought as far as their Motion in Limine to have the Court rule on today. I mean, this is just their Motion in Limine regarding specific documents to have the Court rule on now. is many others that they're not apparently at least at this time having the Court rule on. This is obviously one that is not identified in their--in their motion. Ϊ mean, the reason why I'm saying this, Judge, is that this is a -- a pretty detailed ten-page document and I'm already looking at some things that I would suggest that I--I would have had some arguments concerning 403 objections in terms of more prejudicial than probative. Ιf the Court wants me to go sit down and spend--

THE COURT: Well--

MR. NICKOLA: --the time because I--I see things right now where there--somebody indicates, so I "F" up already, using the entire indication of the word and that's within the first ten lines, and then I mean, there is other foul language and I don't know all of the exact details, but it's not a part of what they specifically thought to bring before the Court today, that's all is what I'm suggesting.

MR. PLUMMER: Your Honor, if I can speak for the 1 prosecution--2 THE COURT: All right--3 It--it wasn't the focus of any-MR. PLUMMER: 4 thing in our Motion in Limine, but it was a part of the 5 packet that we gave counsel some time ago that these 6 were pieces of evidence that we would very well be seek-7 ing admission to in trial. 8 Now, counsel does mention, I think the Court 9 said some 170 some e-mails and there has been discus-10 sions all along about trying to pare that down. 11 THE COURT: We are gonna talk about it, but I 12 thought we could finish--the next thing I thought we 13 should go to is the phone call from Jerry Cassaday to 14 his brother, get that ruled on. If there is anything 15 else that should be encompassed in the Motion to Quash, 16 argue any of that --17 MR. NICKOLA: Okay, yeah, the--18 THE COURT: -- then I'll rule on the Motion to 19 Quash then we can go to the--20 MR. NICKOLA: Right, yeah, this would be because 21 this was not entered at district court--22 THE COURT: Not there, so we will save that for, 23 we will just put it aside and know that you wanna argue 24 about it and clarify the scope of any proposed exhibit 25

ľ	
1	which is just setting it aside is the proposed exhibit
2	which may come in, it is of September 24 instant mes-
3	sage. And again, I wasn't sure if I got all of it be-
4	cause my page at the top was a little cutoff and it
5	looked like there might be something missing on the top
6	of my page.
7	MR. PLUMMER: Right, your Honor, just for the
8	record ours actually starts at page 2, cutoff at the top
9	like this, quote, and cry and cry, and goes through to
10	THE COURT: You don't have the prior page I
11	have?
12	MR. PLUMMER: No, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: I assume, Ms. Mabry gave me these
14	with the package, you know, some big package
15	MR. PLUMMER: Right
16	THE COURT:was sent up there. So I have one
17	that starts, and wait for him to die.
18	MR. PLUMMER: Whoops, maybe I'm on theI
19	thought that was on the next page.
20	MS. MABRY: Go ahead.
21	MR. PLUMMER: Is there a page number at the bot-
22	tom of yours, your Honor?
23	THE COURT: Page 1.
24	MR. PLUMMER: Well, it is the same document we
25	have except that's the front in

ŀ	
1	THE COURT: Major.
2	MR. PLUMMER: At least in this book we don't
3	have a page 1. I'm afraid in the course of all the
4	copying we may have just made a mistake in ours.
5	THE COURT: I don't mind sharing it, it's not a
б	regular copy anyway.
7	MR. PLUMMER: Thank you, your Honor. Maybe dur-
8	ing a, if we do have a break maybe we could make a copy
9	of that page 1.
10	THE COURT: I don't know if you can make any
11	copies, I have no idea.
12	MR. PLUMMER: Oh, good point.
13	LAW CLERK: Mr. Nickola, do you have a copy of
14	this document?
15	MR. NICKOLA: Not handy, no.
16	THE COURT: You have never seen it before
17	today
18	MR. NICKOLA: No, no, Judge, I'm not suggesting
19	that
20	THE COURT: Oh, okay. I just didn't know
21	MR. NICKOLA: I'm not suggesting that
22	THE COURT:if you had ever seen it even
23	before.
24	MR. NICKOLA: Yeah, there wasthere has been a
25	multitude of things that I have, but II can tell the

б

Court that there has never been a representation that everything I have been given was gonna be used at court, I mean, I'm just—I think that I heard that from counsel and that is not correct. I mean, things were turned over to me pursuant to my disclosure demand and that's—that's fine, but there was never any indication that all of these things are gonna be admitted. The Motion in Limine is what I'm here today for, that is what is scheduled for today and that is what I'm prepared to argue about, and my—my motions as well.

THE COURT: Right. We are working on yours now. We are still on yours, I know.

MR. NICKOLA: I--I know.

THE COURT: Is it all right if, excuse me, I have a little congestion today. Shall we go onto the phone conversation that I mentioned, that is also the subject of the Motion to Quash Mr. Nickola had filed in this case, and so, Mr. Nickola, if you wanna be heard first, please.

MR. NICKOLA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: See, your brief covered it.

MR. NICKOLA: Yes, it did, Judge, particularly page 16.

THE COURT: Page 6--starting at page 16.

MR. NICKOLA: There is -- the phone conversation

Ç

in particular that we are dealing here with is, is the phone conversation on November 7th, a discussion between John Cassaday and Jerry Cassaday that was described, obviously the transcript speaks for itself, Judge. The judge made partial rulings and then allowed some of the rulings to—some of the conversation to come in. My objections were as—as I have indicated in—in my brief pursuant to People versus DeRushia, that the statements were inadmissible hearsay, in that I think that the court had allowed some of them in, his mental impressions, but I think that the DeRushia case was pretty specific, that unless the declarant talked about how they feel then the statement should be excluded.

In this particular case, Jerry Cassaday did not indicate how he felt. There was just a brother's interpretation of a tone. There was nothing in terms of any type of foundation or anything like that that as it relates to the particular statement as it was offered to the court, and we think that the judge was partially right in terms of his ruling, we think the rest of it should be deemed admissible as well because there is no discussion about his state of mind, and we believe it is inadmissible hearsay. That's all I have on that issue.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

MS. MABRY: Judge, Mr. Nickola is correct the

transcript pretty much speaks for itself but we would submit that these two brief conversations that John Michael Cassaday had with his brother Jerry are absolutely essential. I--to put them in context, one occurs a--a day or two before he murders Bruce Miller and the other occurs the day after he returns from having murdered Bruce Miller, where he is making arrangements for if something to me you will find a briefcase telling--telling you what to do and do that.

He talks about the fact that his brother appeared to be emotionally upset when he made that phone call, and clearly we believe the transcript establishes that it is a state of mind exception under 803(3).

The--when he returns again it is a state of mind exception when he in fact tells his brother you don't wanna know, you don't wanna know.

We believe clearly it fits under that exception to the hearsay rule, and we believe that the defense will be eventually that he did not commit the murder, so these are—this is absolutely relevant to a fact that is gonna be at issue in this case. We have the burden of proof to show that Jerry Cassaday killed Bruce Miller as part of a conspiracy with Sharee Miller.

Furthermore, we believe it also fits under the exception of a co-conspirator statement too, it is in

furtherance of the conspiracy, he is leaving this briefcase so that somebody knows what to do in case he is caught or doesn't make it back, and we believe it fits under that exception as well.

Another possible exception that we don't necessarily wanna rely on is the fact that it wouldn't be offered for the truth of the matter asserted.

The--the fact that a briefcase is found is gonna be proven independently of this statement, it's simply the fact that the statement was made, the timing of the statement, and it goes to show that in fact it is more likely than not, based on these statements, that Jerry Cassaday killed Bruce Miller.

If I could have just a moment, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

(Counsel conferring with counsel)

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Nickola, go ahead then.

MR. NICKOLA: Judge, we would simply ask the Court to at least as it relates to the first conversation follow the court's decision, I don't believe that he abused his discretion. I think now throwing up arguments that weren't even available at the time, I mean, there is—there is arguments right now. It's possible, Judge, also, I mean, we are talking about a record for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Court to review, now they are throwing up possible. hearsay arguments, that was something that wasn't even felt viable at the time to argue before Judge Hughes in this particular case. You know, Judge, if I think of it as--hearsay still exists in this particular state simply someone saying that I'm okay, never mind, everything is If that is considered an exception to hearsay when there is no discussion whatsoever about the mental intent, Judge, then I guess I'm--I'm a little bit behind on the times because these statements were clear to Judge Hughes and I think that in addition to that simply people having a discussion is not an exception to the hearsay rule. I understand why they wanna get it in and why they wanna try and make it an argument, but that doesn't justify overruling Judge Hughes', finding abuse of discretion, and now applying something that was never argued before him because I think that necessarily would be improper.

THE COURT: Well, the testimony is, as I read it here anyway in the transcript, was offered at page 93, I was just reading it again, it isn't--it was so interrupted with objections and rulings it's a little bit hard to get the exact . . . (Court reading transcript)

All right, to be clear then there were two conversations as pointed out by the People, page 93 he is

speaking of the November 7, '99, conversation, and the second conversation is discussed in the transcript at page 98 which allegedly took place November 9.

It states about six o'clock--really there is very little context on the November 9 conversation offered other than he was home, that is what the testimony is at page 98. The brother was trying to get him to tell him where he had been and his response on page 99, Just trust me, Mike, you don't wanna know, and the brother says I left the conversation at that. Then Ms. Mabry asked about a state of mind which was described as fairly calm.

The earlier conversation on November 7 briefly stated for this record, I'm trying to see if he said what time it was on the day. Oh, I see on page 94 it is at approximately nine o'clock, November 7, 1999. Again, a very short conversation takes place, basically that he is gonna get away for a few days and try to get his thoughts together.

I don't know, Ms. Mabry, if you're really trying to enter into evidence at this time the directions about the briefcase under the bed, but if you--you are or are not?

MS. MABRY: No, the importance of the evidence does not really have anything to do with the briefcase,

it has to do with the timing of the phone call and the fact that it corroborates the fact that he is establishing his absence for that period of time, that he is upset which would be consistent with him driving to Michigan to kill someone.

THE COURT: Right.

M\$. MABRY: And that when he is back he says, you don't wanna know.

Now, is that consistent with going to the lake, no. So we are not gettin' into the truth of the matter asserted for that. We don't believe he went to a lake, and believe me it will be a point of Mr. Nickola's that John Hutchinson more likely committed this murder than Jerry Cassaday.

THE COURT: Well, 803(3) is an exception to the hearsay rule or at least is not excluded by the hearsay rule and it states as follows, a statement of the declarant's then existing state of mind, emotional, sensation or physical condition, goes on, such as intent, plan, motive, design, mental feeling.

Now, the Court certainly believes under the circumstances in this particular case a statement of intent to go to the lake would be a state of mind that can be admitted and obviously I understand it's really for the reserve purpose in this case, but it is admissible as a

state of mind exception to the hearsay rule, and I don't know, again, if you're trying to get the context of, I'm home, in for the proof of the truth of the fact he is home, or just that there was a phone call made to the brother November 9, '99, about six o'clock in the evening.

MS. MABRY: The intent is to show actually the statement, you don't wanna know.

THE COURT: The other statement, all right.

MS. MABRY: You don't wanna know where I was, you don't wanna know.

pears to this Court, in any event, to come in under the exception we have discussed, two or three times statement against interest, 804(b)(3), and the Court believes both of those statements are admissible under exceptions to the hearsay rule, and the Court notes as I have said that Judge Hughes also relied on these statements in binding the defendant over to circuit court, but they're obviously offered for different reasons, the facts of the calls, that's one thing, and that would not be hearsay that there was a call. I don't know if there is any proof of any truth, I'm going to the lake is certainly not for the truth but, in any event, it is certainly admissible as I have previously indicated, 803(3) state of

mind exception to the hearsay rule, and the statement, You don't' want to know, certainly would appear to this Court to be admissible as a statement against interest, 804(b)(3).

So there would be no error by Judge Hughes in relying on or admitting either of the conversations to the limited extent we have discussed here today at the time of trial. So the Motion to Quash relating to those two conversations would also be denied.

Now, let's see, Mr. Nickola, I'm looking at your brief to see again if there are other matters we should rule on.

MR. NICKOLA: I believe, Judge, for purposes of the Motion to Quash that--that exhausts those issues.

Judge, could I just in terms of a clarification because I know--

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.

MR. NICKOLA: And the Court has--has made the ruling as well, is the Court making that ruling also as it relates to this trial that you're going to allow the statements--

THE COURT: Yes, I am making the ruling finding no error by Judge Hughes and indicating to you now in advance that those things again would be admissible at the time of trial, and again, assuming the brother

either testifies or his unavailability is established 1 2 and the transcript is read in. 3 MR. NICKOLA: Okay. I just wanted to make--4 THE COURT: One way or the other--5 MR. NICKOLA: --for--for purposes of the record with that clarification --6 7 THE COURT: Yes--8 MR. NICKOLA: --make the record clear of--of my 9 objections so that they are preserved as it relates to 10 the Court's ruling now as to the trial and their admis-11sibility. Thank you, Judge. THE COURT: All right. So having discussed 12 13 those matters it appears to the Court that unless you 14have further arguments on the Motion to Quash that cov-15 ers the underlying bases for the Motion to Quash. 16 Mr. Nickola, as the proponent of that particular 17 motion, any other aspects of the motion you wanna argue 18 or have rulings upon today? MR. NICKOLA: Not as it relates to the Motion to 19 20 Quash, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: All right. Now, then, Ms. Mabry, if 22 you would be so kind as to prepare an order reflecting 23 the Court's decision that it will not quash the Informa-24 tion in this case, finding there has been no abuse of

discretion on the part of the examining magistrate in

25

binding this matter over to circuit court. The Court 1 2 finding no error occurred in admitting into evidence 3 various hearsay statements for the reasons already on the record, thank you. 4 5 Now, there are Motions in Limine by both sides 6 and I think the effort was made by both of you to try to 7 have us all on the same page at the time of trial, to hopefully not have to spend hours and hours arguing 8 9 these matters during the course of the trial. 10 I wanna return the transcript to the prosecutor 11 that they sent up for me to read, thank you. Mr. Nickola's motion states as follows, Motion 12 in Limine. I think what you were really trying to do is 13 14 get pre-trial rulings on the admissibility of these 15 various items, issue number one in the motion is photo-16 graphs and/or videotapes of the defendant, Sharee 17 Miller. So can we do that one, Ms. Mann or Ms. Mabry, 18 I'm sorry? 19 MS. MABRY: That's--20 THE COURT: Taking his Motion in Limine. 21 MS. MABRY: Okay. It's issue one in his motion. 22 THE COURT: 23 MS. MABRY: Judge, I believe that the photographs that Mr. Nickola is referring to, and they should 24 25 all be right here on the table next to your court

reporter, were the ones that were admitted at the pre-1 liminary examination, many of which depicted the scene 2 of the suicide of Jerry Cassaday where he laid the stage 3 for committing suicide. Putting photographs of his 4 loved ones in front of him, seating himself in a chair 5 facing out on the lake, facing--6 THE COURT: Why don't we have--have all the ones 7 you are speaking of from that scene marked and then we 8 will have numbers, whatever they are, okay, and then we 9 can--they probably can be referenced as a group I'm as-10 suming, but let's see if we can do that. Just give Ms. 11 Christman a minute, please. 12 MR. NICKOLA: Judge, just for purposes of the 13 record, I believe my first issue only deals with the 14 videotapes and photographs they are seeking to admit--15 It says of the defendant, that was THE COURT: 16 17 true. MR. NICKOLA: That's correct, in a sexually pro-18 vocative manner. That's -- that's really the--19 MS. MABRY: Oh, okay--20 MR. NICKOLA: --first issue. 21 THE COURT: All right. Well, I don't have any, 22 I've never seen any photographs, I saw--I was provided a 23 videotape, I have seen the videotape.

MS. MABRY: I believe the photographs he is

24

25

1	talking about probably are contained within the e-mail
2	communications
3	THE COURT: My copies are
4	MS. MABRY:that were submitted
5	THE COURT:so black that I wouldn't know what
6	they are otherwise, it's very hard to tell anything
7	about what they are.
8	THE COURT: The actual originals are in color
9	when they were scanned and sent.
10	THE COURT: So you probably have those that
11	уоч
12	MS. MABRY: I have them withI have the
13	originals
14	THE COURT: Have you seen the colors, the color
15	photographs
16	MR. NICKOLA: Yes, Judge.
17	MS. MABRY: This is
18	THE COURT: Well, those arethat's the e-mails
19	you are talking about?
20	MR. NICKOLA: Well
21	MS. MABRY: Thesethesethere are some photo-
22	graphs in here, while you received a black and white
23	copy and we all have black and white copies, these are
24	the originals here.
25	MS. MABRY: Right. II received black and
	1

1	white copies.
2	THE COURT: Do you wanna see those?
3	MR. NICKOLA: (No verbal response)
4	THE COURT: Go ahead and take a look while she
5	is marking these.
6	MS. MABRY: I
7	THE COURT: I guess you will have to define for
8	me what is a so-called sexually provocative photograph,
9	I don't have any trouble understanding the videotape as
10	sexually provocative.
11	MS. MABRY: Right.
12	THE COURT: The photographs that you're specifi-
13	cally referring to you will have to show me.
14	MR. NICKOLA: I'll show you, Judge.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MR. NICKOLA: There is a series.
17	THE COURT: Well, there
18	MR. NICKOLA: Got them right now.
19	THE COURT: Thank you. Let's see here.
20	So there are four, is that what
21	MR. NICKOLA: No, your Honor, there is more.
22	THE COURT: Four, quote, sexually provocative,
23	end quote, photos, loosely defined.
24	There is four there.
25	(Judge conferring with clerk)

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NICKOLA: Judge, I believe based on the exhibits that I have gone through, I have highlighted the ones that I believe are more prejudicial than probative, they either show my client in a sexually provocative manner or she is exposed, at least her breasts, and she is partially maked. I believe that if the Court wants to hear what my arguments are as it relates to those particular photographs, being that I'm the one that is requesting to exclude those. I have cited the authority that--as it exists in my--in my particular motion starting with at least the issue of the videotape. it is very clear that that is a tape that is an exotic, sexually provocative tape. I have indicated in the record before that I'd be willing to put forward a stipulation that that is the case. I think the prosecutor is going to be able to provide, from their prospective at least, information that suggests that the -- Mr. Cassaday and Ms. Miller had a sexually provocative relationship. And as a result of that there is going to be an ample amount of evidence to show that, absent showing my client naked before a jury engaging in sexual activities.

Certainly, Judge, that--there is ample amount of information to do that, and--and to play that tape before a jury is simply calculated to have the jury pass moral judgment. And frankly, Judge, that particular

tape upon admission I--I would think would at least require enormous amount of voir dire with the prospective jury pool into their sexual beliefs, what they feel is appropriate, inappropriate. It deals on all different facets of morality, and I think that it obviously by virtue of a stipulation can set forth, at least in the jury's mind, along with the other information, it doesn't have any ill effect on the prosecutor's case other than to, you know, basically put my client in front of the jury as it relates to the videotape. And the Court has seen the videotape from my understanding and I think the videotape speaks for itself in terms of my arguments.

Now, as it relates to the photographs, I believe that there are photographs that I have showed the Court, and again my copies weren't colored as well, mine were Xeroxed copies so, some of which were dark and you couldn't really tell what they depicted. I believe at least I--I've tabbed the at least going through the--the prosecutor's proposed exhibits that they at least had indicated for their purpose--their Motion in Limine, the photographs that show at least what would be depicted as my client in either sexually provocative manner. There are several--looks to be--to--to appear to be older pictures where she is on a bed scantily clothed, wearing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

panties, also with her breasts exposed, several of which of the pictures are--could be interpreted to be in a sexual inviting type of way, I suppose. Other ones may not be arguably, but still I think that as it relates to this particular jury the points that they're trying to make are points that can be easily made with documents that this Court has undoubtedly, based upon its already made rulings, going to be allowing, and so I think that it can be done in very different way without subjecting these jurors again to seeing images of--of my client that I--I think are not necessary to prove their particular points. And I think that obviously the -- the reason they want to put them in is it certainly cracks into at least depending on who the particular juror is and depending on what their religion or what their moralistic background is, it -- it certainly invites a massive inquiry in terms of how they perceive these things because obviously if that was a part of the evidence going to be admitted then I just think that every single juror is going to have to have some specific inquiries in terms of things that they're not gonna be, and I don't think it would fool anybody, but I don't think--I think the Court could recognize as well that a lot of people are not going to speaking frankly about sex because I would be willing to say that the majority of

whether it is with their spouse or close friend, but when we are talking about a First Degree Premeditated Murder case where my client is facing life with no possibility of parole, I have but no lesser obligation as her sole advocate to get into those areas, and I--I think that a lot of that, although that may be a part of where voir dire is at anyway to certain—to a certain extent, but as it—it relates the—the graphic nature of the photographs we can get around that, Judge, and—and I think that suffice to say with the Court's rulings on other matters and stipulations to the fact that they had a sexually provocative relationship, it's—it's—all it is is piling on in attempt to cloud a—cast a cloud over my client that she is some sort of immoral person.

MS. MABRY: We have to show that Sharee Miller or that Jerry Cassaday killed Bruce Miller because of this woman, Sharee Miller, because they had an affair. No, I don't think so. I think you've got to get in, we've got to get into the depth of how she manipulated him, how she drew him in, that this was not a one-sided relationship, it was a two-sided relationship. We need to get into the fact that these photographs that he is talking about were retrieved off of the shooter's hard drive, on his computer, that they were sent by her.

The videotape for Jerry's Eyes Only was found at 1 the scene of the suicide of the shooter, they were very, 2 very much involved, something that mere e-mails cannot 3 project. It is part of her entire scheme of manipula-4 tion, they are going to be asking how could this guy 5 get -- be manipulated into killing for this woman, how? 6 These videotape--that videotape as well as the 7 photographs are more probative on a very, very relevant 8 issue than prejudicial. I agree they are prejudicial to 9 I agree that they're probably embarrassing to her, 10 but they're absolutely essential to the prosecutor's 11 case to show why this man would kill for this woman. 12 I happen to notice on the second set THE COURT: 13 you sent up here on October now, four of the 12, I be-14 lieve I counted 12, are exactly the same, and there are 15 two more that are the same picture. Are you familiar, 16 do both of you see it that way? 17 MR. NICKOLA: Well, Judge, it at least looks as 18 if there is--19 It's either exactly the same or a 20 THE COURT: hand might have been moved slightly over--21 MR. NICKOLA: Multiple--22 MS. MABRY: Okay. 23 24 MR. NICKOLA: Right. MS. MABRY: And--and I should note for the 25

б

record that some of the photographs that are being objected to are during the time periods when Sharee Miller is conveying to Jerry Cassaday that she is pregnant with his child, and so he wants to see, you know, how her pregnancy is developing, so she sends him pictures where —of her naked stomach and breasts where she, you know, pushing out her stomach.

MR. NICKOLA: Judge, just in response to that, I believe the prosecutor in their Motion in Limine have approximately 100, almost 200 exhibits, many of which they have and they are going be forthcoming with, depict my client doing the same thing clothed, without question, and she is not going to say that that's not true. I mean, there is probably at least ten, 15 photographs where the same thing is depicted without exposing her breasts in a little negligee, oh—and some of which squeezing, you know, the same—the same as the Court can see, and—and if the Court were able to see those because that is gonna be the next aspect of it, if the Court reserves its ruling to see that, it's gonna see that there is ample enough information and photographs to suggest that.

And my only response to her statement is, is that the Court has had an opportunity to see these emails and review these e-mails. The content of the

e-mails in terms of I love you and this and that, that obviously, I mean, what word describes somebody's alleged ability to manipulate somebody other than to be in love with them, but to show this tape or this tape is nothing more, less, or more probative to show that if they wanna--are trying to prove this manipulation, I don't see what evidence or what argument she is making that this tape makes it more probative that she could manipulate him. It simply a sexually erotic tape that is found in his apartment and it's--it's Ms. Miller. I mean, I--I don't see how that tape does anything other than make a jury have this vision of my client exposed in complete nudity performing as the Court knows what it is performing and the jurors are.

I--I would simply say that I--I don't--I can't see where a trial could be a fair trial with this image in a jury's mind when it can be easily circumvented and they have got ample opportunity with the information they have, I mean, the Court has already ruled the suicide note is in, he explains all this, they are gonna be able to show the pregnancy. I mean, they're gonna be able to get into all this with their instant messages based upon the Court's ruling, so to make it sound like this video is the only thing holding this case together I think is--it shows the obviousness of why they want it

in and that's simply to inflame the jury and that's exactly what this tape will do, it will inflame the jury and my client would not be entitled to a fair trial if in fact it was admitted.

MS. MABRY: Judge, if I could?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MABRY: Mr. Nickola did mention that there are photographs where—that depict Ms. Miller clothed and pregnant, but we're not introducing these photographs to show that she was pregnant. We don't believe that she was ever pregnant.

THE COURT: Understand.

MS. MABRY: We are introducing these photographs to show the intensity of their relationship and Jerry Cassaday's response to the intensity of that relationship.

Also, I should note for the record that at least Mr. Nickola has been quoted in <u>The Flint Journal</u> as saying that Mr. Cassaday somehow was stalking this defendant and that she really didn't have much to do with this relationship. That he was the aggressor and just kind of taken off on his own, and that could be a possible defense at trial that either, one, he didn't do it, or he just took off and did it on his own. And if the jury is not aware of the intensity of this relationship

as advanced by this defendant, they're gonna be left with an inadequate picture, and they are definitely more probative than prejudicial.

If there are duplicate photographs, then, yes, they can be taken out--

THE COURT: Well, see there is another issue there I suppose if you look at the time of transmission, like, appear to be the same day but, 10/25/99, a few minutes apart. So there is one, for example, I mean the time states 8:49 and then 8:50 and then we got 8:52, then the next day, no, it's still the same day, I'm sorry, 10/25, then we move over to 9:25 in a negligee, 9:27, 9:28, 9:29 and there is one—the next day then we go to 9:30. I haven't studied how they fit right into the e-mails, I'm not, in terms of intermeshing, with the messages right off the top of my head here 'cause mine were so black I couldn't quite make out what were—what was in the pictures, so let me make the comments about the video first.

I--I'm not in a position to have the whole jury see that whole video, I--I think a couple of minutes would be all, and I think the initial two or three minutes would be more than enough to give the jury the flavor of what is going on. And so, I'm not quite sure if you want me to be the one to cut or let you two be the

1 surgeons, shall we say. I don't want to keep the People 2 from having the jury see what it -- that it exists, what 3 it is, but we don't need to go through the whole entire 4 thing, so--5 MS. MABRY: Judge, the only thing I would ask 6 for if we are going to only introduce a portion is, 7 there is a portion on the video that it shows that she 8 is video taping herself, shows she has the computer 9 screen, that she also has the monitor and the -- she can 10 see herself videotaping herself --11 THE COURT: Right. I think that's at the beginning. 12 13 MS. MABRY: Pardon? 14 THE COURT: I think that's at the beginning. 15 MS. MABRY: Okav. 16 MR. NICKOLA: Judge, within a very short period 17 of time I believe in terms of the videotape, I under-18 stand where she is at, and if the Court is going to rule 19 that part comes in, that doesn't get into the sexual be-20 havior and whatnot, but it quickly--21 THE COURT: Well, it will--22 MR. NICKOLA: --gets to the point within--within 23 two or--24 THE COURT: As she starts to take off her 25 clothes I'll get into that, but I'm not gonna get into

1 the masturbation, okay, we are just going to stop and 2 all of this fondling stuff, I'm not going to have the 3 jury see it in my court. So that's it. The beginning 4 that she starts to do it and gets her start--self on the 5 bed and arrays(sic) herself in this position, I'm--in 6 front of the camera that Ms. Mann mentioned and starts 7 to strip off her clothes, I think I'll just tell the jury I'm not -- that will be enough and that will be it, 8 9 so. 10 MS. MABRY: Judge, I was wondering if we could 11 just show, if you are going to show a couple minutes of 12 the beginning, if we could make a statement to the jury 13 that the rest of the tape contains a--14 THE COURT: Additional graphic material that I 15 do not believe is--would be more prejudicial than 16 probative. 17 MS. MABRY: I--18 Unless you don't want me to say it THE COURT: 19 'cause I'm gonna rule it--20 MS. MABRY: My request would--would be to simply 21 say that the rest of the tape shows her masturbating, 22 end of story. 23 THE COURT: End of it, instead of show it--24 MR. NICKOLA: Well, I--I--I would object to it. 25 I--I would object and I'm not stipulating to anything,

if we going to start showing the video--

THE COURT: Do you want it all shown, then it all will be shown--

MR. NICKOLA: No, I didn't--I didn't--

THE COURT: --it's up to you.

MR. NICKOLA: Judge.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. NICKOLA: I'm commenting on what the Court has already ruled, so I'm not arguing with the Court, I'm simply trying to make a record here concerning this case, so I'm not criticizing the Court, I'm--I'm responding to what she is saying, she has indicated she wants an instruction which I have not seen, I can get the gist of what she is saying, but I'm just indicating to the Court that I'm objecting. Before I said I would offer a stipulation to resolve the whole problem, I'm--I'm not offering that stipulation now, and I would object to any instruction. I think it's pretty obvious what may or may not happen after that, but I don't think that giving blow by blow details to a jury, I think that's just as prejudicial as is probative. More prejudicial I should say than probative, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The Court feels it has wide discretion on the admissibility of evidence and I have seen the video and I think to have the jury see it

is unnecessary. I think two to three minutes maybe, I'm not sure of the timing because I haven't seen it for several months, would be more than enough for the jury to know what it is and who is in it and how it is being created and I think if she wants to have a statement that the rest of it shows her masturbating that would certainly allow her to have the evidence without having your client subjected, frankly, to having a jury see that tape. So I just think that's a better way to resolve it.

MR. NICKOLA: So at the point--

THE COURT: One sentence, the remainder of the tape will not be shown in which the defendant masturbates, that's end of it, one sentence.

MR. NICKOLA: Now, just--just to--to--

THE COURT: And I know you're objecting to any of it being shown--

MR. NICKOLA: No, I know, Judge, and just to clarify 'cause I--I--there were the two tapes that were apart of this reviewed today and the Court is indicating that at the point in time after the set up is started that at the time of the disrobe, that the--the beginning process of disrobing that's where the Court is gonna cut it, right?

THE COURT: Somewhere right in that area.

1 MR. NICKOLA: Because I believe that two or three minutes into it we're well into the--2 3 THE COURT: Well--4 MR. NICKOLA: --graphic material--THE COURT: -- I can tell you I'm not sure I'm 5 6 getting the timing but it takes --7 MR. NICKOLA: Right--8 THE COURT: --a minute or two by the times she 9 sets it all up and gets on the bed and I don't know, but 10 if you have any trouble agreeing on the, you two can 11 look at it and I will sit with you and look at it again right before we play it if you want me to, to be sure we 12 all agree how far it will be played. 13 14 Mr. Plummer. 15 MR. PLUMMER: Your Honor, if I may? 16 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 17 MR. PLUMMER: Your Honor, I think it might be 18 safest if we were to sit with the whole tape and if we 19 could agree on that stopping point with Mr. Nickola--20 THE COURT: Yeah, try to do it--21 MR. PLUMMER: --to--to then tape that to a copy 22 so that there is no chance that anymore could be seen. 23 THE COURT: Well, I'm favor of that, too. 24 MR. PLUMMER: And--and label it as that one is 25 labeled--

1 THE COURT: That one--2 MR. PLUMMER: --for Jerry's eyes so that we basically have that same tape but nothing after that to--3 4 for any risk--5 THE COURT: So there is no error, no possibility 6 of an erroneous portrayal of anymore of it--7 MR. NICKOLA: Right. And that--8 THE COURT: --or playing of anymore--9 MR. NICKOLA: --and just for purposes of -- of the 10 record, I don't oppose that way of handling it, your 11 Honor, and I know the Court may be thinking why are you talking still, but believe me I have been involved in 12 the Court of Appeals on issues like this--13 14 THE COURT: I understand--15 MR. NICKOLA: --where nothing was said and they 16 construed--construed stipulation, so if I were to--17 THE COURT: No, I understand--18 MR. NICKOLA: --agree that that's the proper way 19 to handle it, Judge, I wanna make the record clear that 20 I'm not waiving any objections to the videotape for any-21 one who may read this--22 THE COURT: Understand you're not, you're ob-23 jecting to the whole tape and I'm allowing a portion of 24 the tape only. 25 MR. NICKOLA: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: With a brief summation of what is on the rest of the tape.

MR. PLUMMER: Right, and I'm just suggesting, your Honor, that we actually introduce a copy--

THE COURT: All right. We will try to do that,
I don't know what equipment, I don't know where the
equipment, whether the sheriff or if you have to go to
Lansing, I don't know where you do it, but I suggest it
happen. They have it here, Detective Shanlian, you have
it?

DETECTIVE SHANLIAN: (No verbal response)

THE COURT: Photographs, do you wanna comment on those?

MS. MABRY: Judge, just briefly, again they're more probative than prejudicial. This defendant led Jerry to believe that he was avenging the killer of two sets of babies, not one, but two sets of babies, and so, part of her scheme to get him inflamed and involved in this alleged parenthood was to send these photographs to inflame Jerry, that yes, I'm pregnant, and the other photographs of her just disrobed were to show the intensity of their relationship otherwise the jury will not quite understand why somebody would kill just for a simple affair.

To the extent that there are duplicates we don't

object to admitting just one of each of the photographs.

THE COURT: They're not exactly duplicates but they're--the hand, the arm is moved slightly above and below the abdomen.

I think one, unless there is something I'm missing in terms of the e-mails that correspond to them that one of those is enough, that is what I'm saying. I'll only allow one pregnant, allegedly pregnant photo in the negligee and then there was a page that has like four or five depicting the abdomen and breast area and it appears that is all, I don't know those would have been sent, I guess the way they do the submissions or transmissions I should say, is as a group, is that right—

MS. MABRY: No, no--

THE COURT: --or did you all compile this into one, I don't know how that works?

MS. MABRY: I would ask that if there are duplicates on a single day that we will just put one in. We want to show that she had a flurry of, you know, activity over a period of days to inflame him, and then soon after he gets these photographs she say, oh, by the way, now Bruce killed your babies.

THE COURT: Right. But take this one, it's October 27, which it has four or five on a page. I don't know if these were transmitted in one--

1 MS. MABRY: That was one transmission. 2 THE COURT: Mission, all right. 3 Well, in any event, the Court has made a ruling, 4 the others will come in. I understand the theory as to 5 the scheme of the Defendant Miller to entice, shall we 6 say, or inflame Cassaday so that he would accomplish the 7 murder of Bruce Miller and it's part of that case. we will just take out duplicates, but other than they 8 9 will come in. 10 Now, I'll return these also. I sent back the 11 September and these are the October set. 12 Let's see now. Next issue, number two, I think we need to just go ahead and start up with the e-mails 13 14 because the next issue deals with the communications or 15 discussions between the parties Miller and Cassaday. 16 MR. NICKOLA: Yeah. And, Judge, just for--17 THE COURT: Yes--18 MR. NICKOLA: --purposes of the record, the is-19 sues after two, I think, deal with the Court's rulings 20 that the Court has already made, the Court--as far as 21. my--my issue number three is the ruling that this Court 22 already made, I believe, that my objections were--are preserved and as well as the suicide note--23 24 THE COURT: Which is --

MR. NICKOLA: -- and then finally I believe num-

25

1 ber five as well as the instant, AOL instant messages 2 the one that was dated November 8th. Those three issues the Court has already addressed and made rulings on. 3 4 My--I just offer the--preserve the objection for 5 the record, but I would agree with the Court that issue two really ties in with the prosecutor's Motion in Lim-6 7 ine where they seek to admit the documents. 8 THE COURT: And I think we have covered really 9 everything in yours except the package of e-mails, 10 right, Ms. Mabry? 11 MS. MABRY: I'm sorry, the--12 THE COURT: Your Motion in Limine--13 MS. MABRY: Right--14 THE COURT: -- also raised issues that I think 15 I've ruled on except for the package of the e-mails. 16 MR. NICKOLA: The only thing I would suggest to 17 the Court is, is that I believe there were a couple 18 other issues that the prosecutor's Motion in Limine 19 dealt with in sort of a noxious sort of way because 20 they're not simply cut right out but they are mentioned in there, so I think at least in terms--21 22 THE COURT: Well--23 MR. NICKOLA: --probably are--24 THE COURT: She speaks about a Motion in Limine 25 about a polygraph, I'm assuming we are all agreeing on

that issue, I'll--1 2 MS. MABRY: I would assume so, but I wanted to 3 make that clear for the record--4 THE COURT: But--5 MS. MABRY: -- that there would be no mention of 6 that--7 THE COURT: To whatever extent there may be a 8 polygraph involved it is inadmissible and I will not 9 permit it. That's easy. That may be the only easy 10 thing we have today. 11 MR. NICKOLA: There were--it--it does just say, 12 Judge, as it relates to the, for technical purposes, al-13 though it is not specified, but in the introduction 14 they're seeking to admit all physical evidence that was 15 admitted at the preliminary examine and all statements 1.6 introduced at the preliminary exam. 17 Just my response to that would be I would object 18 to the statements. I don't know if at this point 19 they're trying to say that just admit the transcript, but I would object to that. They--they say that in 20 21 your--22 THE COURT: You don't mean the whole transcript 23 of district court hearing do you, Ms. Mabry? That is 24 not what she meant.

MS. MABRY: No, I don't believe, no.

25

MR. NICKOLA: That's what-THE COURT: No.

MR. NICKOLA: Right, but that is what it says in--in the introduction, Judge, so I'm--I'm just trying to clear that up, that's why I say I don't think it was something that was specified, but it is--they do say they wanna admit all physical evidence admitted at the preliminary exam and all statements introduced at the preliminary exam.

MS. MABRY: I would agree that it is all the physical exhibits which again we have on the counsel table over here, and also, we have met with Mr. Nickola privately at the pre-trial and reviewed all the potential evidence which may be introduced at trial.

THE COURT: You attached a list I know of some items--

MS. MABRY: Right--

THE COURT: --there and I assume you all have seen them, but if you need the ruling on some item, fine, but why don't we start with the booklet now of e-mails--

MR. NICKOLA: Right--

THE COURT: --which both of you want to get the clarification on. Is that a good idea, is that where we are? Do you wanna take about a ten-minute recess before

1 we do it--2 MR. NICKOLA: Yeah, could you. 3 THE COURT: Do that? Okay, we will a ten-minute 4 recess and then start the e-mails. 5 (At 11:25 a.m. court recessed) 6 (At 11:39 a.m. court reconvened) 7 THE COURT: All right, everybody let's be seated 8 and see if we can start now with the packet of e-mails 9 in the matter of Miller, and I think the first one just 10 for the record that I have received has a date on it at the top 8/28/99, just so we're all--can we look--look at 11 12 them in order, I think chronologically in order if that 13 is agreeable with everybody. 14MR. NICKOLA: It's agreeable with the defendant, 15 your Honor. 16 THE COURT: I think that's the first one, let's 17 see here. Do you think that's the first one, do you 18 have one any--19 MS. MABRY: Eight/twenty-eight, yes. 20 THE COURT: Look at the top, 8/28/99. 21 MS. MABRY: Hi, sweetheart, here is my schedule. 22 THE COURT: That's the first one everybody has, 23 just to be sure? 24 Now, I--a handwritten list of these was made by 25 my office and I don't claim it's totally accurate or totally complete, but perhaps as we go through today, I think each of you picked up a copy of it, I know Mr. Nickola asked to have a copy of it.

Ms. Mann, did you get a copy, handwritten?
MS. MABRY: (No verbal response)

THE COURT: Okay. So I was just using that as a tracking device to keep track of how many and what dates we're talking about just to help me as we went through this, so.

It's my--I wanna understand something now from the People in the case. Are you indicating to the Court that you're going to be offering or your desire would be to offer each and every page of this package of materials?

MS. MABRY: That is, but I will tell you that since then Mr. Plummer and I have met and pared down and excluded some of the e-mails that we feel that we can live without, out of the packet that was submitted to the Court and to Mr. Nickola.

THE COURT: Do you have a record that you're using in terms of your preparation that just goes through and documents dates of transmissions? See what I wondered, is this everything that was transmitted between 8/28 and the last one which is--

MS. MABRY: No--

1	THE COURT:a photo of 11/12?
2	MS. MABRY: No, very
3	THE COURT: That'smine is it then, what I have
4	or there is a lot
5	MS. MABRY: Stack
б	THE COURT:more than this
7	MR. PLUMMER: Here
8	THE COURT:but these are ones you picked out
9	for now, I mean how, what it is
10	MR. NICKOLA: Well, Judge, I thinkI think in
11	terms of what Ms. MannMabry has indicated is that
12	therethere is a great deal more e-mails.
1.3	THE COURT: There is even more than these?
14	MR. NICKOLA: Yes, many more.
15	MS. MABRY: I'm holding up right now for the
16	Court the ones that we weeded out to begin with.
17	MR. NICKOLA: Right. And that's what the Court
18	has.
19	MS. MABRY: These are not being sought to be in-
20	troduced into evidence and it is at least two inches
21	THE COURT: Okay. Eight/twenty eight 'til 11/12
22	which is a picture of a couple polar bears it looks
23	like, that's the pack I was given and that
24	MR. PLUMMER: Right. That's
25	MR. NICKOLA: Right

MR. PLUMMER: -- the first paring down. 1 That's the first pare down. 2 THE COURT: MS. MABRY: Right, from--3 THE COURT: 4 Okay---- this and this is what we had to 5 MS. MABRY: begin with, three inches--6 7 THE COURT: Um-mm--MS. MABRY: --we took two inches off. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. So I just wanna understand 10 now. Now, probative value, beyond the fact of the re-11 lationship that it was conducted over the Internet in 12 cyberspace, so to speak, to a large extent, could we 13 just take 8/28/99, I mean, look at it. I read it, I 14 15 tried to read these over a couple different times for 16 different reasons. 17 MS. MABRY: I could address the probative value of that first one, Judge, because I have highlighted 18 19 ones that I felt that we really needed and this would be 20 one of them for the reason that the third sentence from 21 the bottom, Jerry writes, print it out. He gives her a 22 schedule and he says print it out. 23 Now, there was some mention at the preliminary exam about, now why would he say that instant message? 24 25 Well, he believes in saving and printing out for direc-

tions, a planner, he is a planner, he is a homicide 1 detective, he documents everything, this confirms that. 2 Here is my schedule when you come, print it out, keep 3 The same thing he did with the instant message. 4 THE COURT: So really all you're saying all you 5 wanted to get in in this whole document was--6 Well, it shows that --MS . MABRY: 7 THE COURT: --print it out? 8 MS. MABRY: No, no, it--it also shows that they 9 are actually meeting physically. They don't just commu-10 11 nicate by e-mail. THE COURT: Well, I know there is at least a 12 couple of times they do, I don't know how many--13 Right. MS. MABRY: 14 I probably don't have any idea how THE COURT: 15 many actually, but several of a --16 Right. And it shows the extent of 17 MS. MABRY: their relationship by 8/28 of '99. 18 The next e-mail I should point out--19 THE COURT: Well, let me ask, let's try to fig-20 ure out how we are gonna do this because at the begin-21 ning you're right, it talks about, let me give you my 22 schedule so you will know how it all falls out and then 23 at the bottom, print it out. 24 Obviously, there is nothing in this whole docu-25

ment that deals with the planning of the death of Bruce 1 Miller, so I wanna understand exactly what probative 2 value the document has on an element and issue in the 3 4 case. MS. MABRY: Judge, just as they said in 5 Vandervliet regarding the prior bad acts, they used the 6 7 term that the jury would be left with an conceptional and chronological void without these e-mails. 8 would be lost as to what occurred between these two in-9 dividuals prior to killing Bruce Miller. 10 THE COURT: Well, I would suggest, let me ask 11 12 you a question. Is anything on it offered for the truth, I don't thinks so? 13 MS. MABRY: No, no, and most of these--14 THE COURT: Not a word--15 MS. MABRY: --they're being offered as--as you 16 correctly point out, for the untruth to tell you the 17 18 truth. MR. NICKOLA: I guess I don't get that. 19 MS. MABRY: The fact that she was pregnant, we 20 21 don't believe she was pregnant--22 THE COURT: For example. But those are her, again, those may be her statements which again to the 23 extent like we talked about ---24 25 MS. MABRY: Right--